



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/698,859 | 10/31/2003 | Liang Fang | NOR-1148 | 9345 |
| 37172 | 7590 | 12/29/2006 | EXAMINER | |
| WOOD, HERRON & EVANS, LLP (NORDSON) 2700 CAREW TOWER 441 VINE STREET CINCINNATI, OH 45202 | | | TALBOT, BRIAN K | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 1762 | |
| SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE | | NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE | |
| 3 MONTHS | | 12/29/2006 | ELECTRONIC | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Notice of this Office communication was sent electronically on the above-indicated "Notification Date" and has a shortened statutory period for reply of 3 MONTHS from 12/29/2006.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

krooney@whepatent.com
mhines@whepatent.com
usptodock@whepatent.com

| | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/698,859 | FANG ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Brian K. Talbot | 1762 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 June 2006.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 31 October 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/10/04; 4/12/04; 3/10/05; 6/8/06</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

1. Claims 1-11 remain in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

With respect to claims 5 and 6, the method further comprises moving the jetting valve, but however, fails to recite that the steps of causing, breaking and applying are repeated after the step of “further moving”. Clarification is requested.

With respect to claim 5, the claim can be not further limiting as the jetting valve is recited as being moved in an X or Y direction previously. The Examiner suggests the term “about one” should be recited as “about another” to indicate that the jetting valve is moved in a “different direction”. See claims 6 and 7 for clarification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Henninger (4,736,704).

Henninger (4,736,704) teaches an apparatus for applying solder masking for a circuit board. Small shots of coating material is applied to a circuit board by means of a pressurized fluid pump. An XY positioning system is used to applying the coating to the desired areas (abstract and Figs. 1 and 10). Land 4 is located on the circuit board.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Bok (5,266,349).

Bok (5,266,349) teaches a method of discrete conformal coating. The method includes pressurizing the coating, longitudinally advancing the surface to be coated such as a circuit board, feeding the coating as a plurality of droplets. The feeding is triggered by an ON/OFF switch (abstract and Figs.4-6). In Fig. 6 and (col. 6, lines 10-15), solder contact (55) is coated with the conformal coating.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henninger (4,736,704) or Bok (5,266,349) in combination with Hynes et al. (6,447,847).

Features described above concerning Henninger (4,736,704) or Bok (5,266,349) are incorporated here.

Henninger (4,736,704) or Bok (5,266,349) fail to teach movement of the “coating dispenser” being in the X, Y and Z directions.

Hynes et al. (6,447,847) teaches a conformal coating system wherein the dispensing mechanism is moveable in the X, Y and Z directions as well as rotation about the Z axis (abstract).

Therefore it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Henninger (4,736,704) or Bok (5,266,349) conformal coating process by incorporating the movement f the dispenser in the X, Y and Z directions as evidenced by Hynes et al. (6,447,847) with the expectation of achieving a more precise deposition of the conformal coating.

With respect to claims 9-11, which recite volume of coating material, droplet rate and area of application, it is the Examiner's position that these are "result effective variables" which are controlled by a practitioner in the art to provide optimum results. Absent a showing of criticality regarding these features, it is the Examiner's position that one skilled in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success with the claimed parameters and hence would be deemed as an obvious modification of the art.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian K. Talbot whose telephone number is (571) 272-1428. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 6AM-3PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Timothy H. Meeks can be reached on (571) 272-1423. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



12/20/06

Brian K. Talbot
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1762

BKT